

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/678,549	10/04/2000	Rois O. Cordova	INTL-0473-US(P10020)	5766
21906	7590	06/30/2004		
TROP PRUNER & HU, PC 8554 KATY FREEWAY SUITE 100 HOUSTON, TX 77024				
			EXAMINER FLYNN, KIMBERLY D	
			ART UNIT 2153	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/678,549

Applicant(s)

CORDOVA, ROIS O.

Examiner

Kimberly D Flynn

Art Unit

2153

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-25.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.


8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Continuation of 5. The applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant contends that the rejection is deficient since it does not show any rationale from within the cited art to make the claimed combination. Applicant also states that the Examiner simply says that it would be most time efficient, and that nothing in Gilbert or Shepherd suggests any reason to combine their teachings. Examiner disagrees. Examiner stated in the previous rejection the following:

In similar Gilbert discloses a system for multicast message distribution wherein the network has an originating node that sends a message for ultimate receipt by a subset of nodes in a polynomial expansion manner. The originating node sends a message to a limited number of nodes; each node also receives a unique list of other nodes that should ultimately receive the message. Each of these other nodes then sends the message to one or more nodes on its list, along with a unique subset of nodes that still have not received the message. Given the teachings of Gilbert, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the software distributing system disclosed by Shepherd to include the unique node list as taught by Gilbert so that the software package can be sent from the originating node or processor-based system without having to incur substantial connect-time, thus allowing the software packages to be received in the most time-efficient manner that is possible. Therefore the aforementioned limitations would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Shepard. Examiner maintains the combination reads on the claimed limitation and that proper rationale for the combination is present.

Applicant contends that Mapson fails to anticipate claim 2 or render it obvious. The Applicant is reminded that claims 2 and 8 are rejected as being obvious over Shepherd in view of Gilbert in further view of Mapson. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).



GLENTON B. BURGESS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

BEST AVAILABLE COPY